



Commissioner of Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
PO Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450  
United States of America

By EFS

**In Re Application of:** Keith James Hensel  
**US Application Number:** 10/562,025  
**Filing Date:** 22 December 2005  
**Title:** Juicer  
**Group Art Unit:**  
**Examiner:**  
**Attorney Docket No:** BRE0308U

9 May 2011

Dear Sirs,

Response After Final Rejection

The Applicant is in receipt of the final rejection mailed on 12 April 2011. The purpose of this reply is to demonstrate that the Examiner's rejection is well outside of the well established law as it is known from the United States Supreme Court case of KSR International Co. v Teleflex, Inc, 550 US 398 (2007).

The Examiner is urged to recognize that KSR did not radically alter the law of obviousness so much as reverse the federal Circuit's prior practice of requiring an explicit motive, teaching or suggestion. For the Examiner to succeed with his arguments, it is required that the Examiner demonstrate either a known problem or an implied motivation (in the